## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

VIACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC., COMEDY ) PARTNERS, COUNTRY MUSIC. TELEVISION, INC., PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORPORATION, and BLACK ENTERTAINMENT TELEVISION, LLC,		
Plaintiffs,		
vs.	NO.	07-CV-2203
YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and GOOGLE, INC.,		
Defendants.		
THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION PREMIER LEAGUE LIMITED, BOURNE CO., et al., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,		
Plaintiffs,	NO	07 07 2500
vs.	NO.	07-CV-3582
YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and GOOGLE, INC.,		
Defendants.		

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF BRENT HURLEY SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA TUESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2008

BY: ANDREA M. IGNACIO HOWARD, CSR, RPR, CLR CSR LICENSE NO. 9830 JOB NO. 15688

AUGUST 26, 2008 11:02 a.m. VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF BRENT HURLEY SHEARMAN & STERLING, 525 Market Street, San Francisco, California, pursuant to notice, before ANDREA M. IGNACIO HOWARD, CLR, RPR, CSR License No. 9830. 

	3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS VIACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC.:
4	JENNER & BLOCK
5	By: DONALD B. VERRILLI, Jr., Esq.
6	GINGER D. ANDERS, Esq.
7	1099 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 900
8	Washington, D.C. 20001
9	(202) 639-6000 dverrilli@jenner.com
10	
11	FOR THE LEAD PLAINTIFFS AND PROSPECTIVE CLASS:
12	BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN LLP
13	By: DAVID R. HASSEL, Esq.
14	1285 Avenue of The Americas
15	New York, New York 10019
16	(212) 554-1533 davidh@blbglaw.com
17	
18	FOR THE DEFENDANTS YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC and
19	GOOGLE, INC.:
20	MAYER BROWN LLP
21	By: MATTHEW D. INGBER, Esq.
22	BRIAN WILLEN, Esq.
23	1675 Broadway
24	New York, New York 10019
25	(212) 506-2146 mingber@mayer.com

		4
1	APPEARANCES (Continued.)	
2		
3	ALSO PRESENT:	
4	GOOGLE	
5	By: ADAM L. BAREA, Litigation Counsel	
6	1600 Amphitheater Parkway	
7	Mountain View, California 94043	
8	(650) 214-4879 adambarea@google.com	
9		
10	KELLY TRUELOVE, Ph.D., Consultant	
11	KEN REESER, Videographer.	
12		
13	00	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
2 11:06:55 2005 --
```

- $3 \mid 11:06:56$  A That's correct.
- 4 | 11:06:57 Q -- correct?
- 5 11:06:57 What was your personal net worth when you
- 6 | 11:07:00 left Fisher Investments in July 2005?
- 7 11:07:08 A I don't recall specifically, but given the
- $^{8}$   $|^{11:07:14}$  college student loans I still had, I was underwater.
- 9 11:07:19 Q And then you took a position at YouTube in
- 10 11:07:23 August 2005; is that correct?
- 11 11:07:24 A That's correct.
- 12 11:07:24 Q And your title was director of finance and
- 13 11:07:28 operations; is that correct?
- 14 11:07:31 A Yeah. Initially I didn't have a title --
- 15 | 11:07:33 O I see.
- 16 11:07:34 A -- but --
- 17 11:07:34 Q But eventually it became --
- 18 | 11:07:36 A -- that's what it became, yeah.
- 19 11:07:37 Q Okay. And what's your present personal net
- 20 | 11:07:39 worth?
- 21 11:07:42 A It's a few million.
- 22 11:07:47 Q A few million.
- 23 11:07:48 More than 5 million?
- 24 11:07:50 A Yes.
- 25 11:07:50 Q Okay. More than 10 million?

- $2 \mid 11:30:57$  could explain why that would be?
- $3 \mid 11:30:59$  A Well, as I said, I produced some of the
- $4 \mid 11:31:02$  slides to compose the board reports. It was a
- $5 \mid 11:31:05$  collaboration effort, and once I e-mailed the board
- $6 \mid 11:31:09$  reports, there were no -- the slides for the board
- $7 \mid 11:31:13$  reports , they were really of no use to me. We were
- $8 \mid 11:31:18$  on to the next month, and so if I made -- I would
- $9 \mid 11:31:27$  delete them. I don't know. It's possible.
- 10 11:31:33 Q Okay. Now, there was a period of time prior
- $11 \mid 11:31:40$  to the acquisition when you were the person
- 12 | 11:31:43 responsible for finances at YouTube; correct?
- 13 11:31:46 A That's right.
- 14 11:31:46 Q And I take it that as part of your duties,
- 15 | 11:31:52 you prepared financial projections; is that correct?
- 16 11:31:56 A That's correct.
- 17 11:31:56 Q And did you prepare those on your office
- 18 | 11:32:02 laptop?
- 19 11:32:03 A Uh-huh.
- 20 11:32:04 Q And where did you store those?
- 21 | 11:32:08 A Just on the --
- 22 11:32:09 MR. INGBER: Objection; assumes facts not in
- 23 11:32:12 evidence.
- 24 11:32:13 THE WITNESS: Huh?
- 25 | 11:32:13 MR. INGBER: Go ahead. You can answer.

- $2 \mid 11:32:15$  MR. VERRILLI: Q. Where did you store those?
- $3 \mid 11:32:16$  A On the laptop.
- $4 \mid 11:32:17$  Q On the laptop?
- 5 11:32:18 A Uh-huh.
- 6 11:32:18 Q Okay. Anywhere else?
- 7 11:32:21 A They were sent through e-mail, but they
- 8 11:32:24 weren't stored. We didn't have a server, a company
- 9 11:32:27 server.
- 10 | 11:32:28 Q And financial projections, I take it, then
- 11 | 11:32:32 were not developed on the Wiki?
- 12 11:32:37 A No.
- 13 11:32:37 Q Okay. So is it possible then that you
- 14 11:32:45 deleted financial projections that you had prepared on
- $15 \mid 11:32:48 \text{ your office laptop?}$
- 16 11:32:51 MR. INGBER: At any time?
- 17 11:32:54 MR. VERRILLI: Yeah.
- $18 \mid 11:32:54$  Q At any time while -- prior to the
- 19 11:32:58 acquisition.
- 20 11:32:59 A It's possible, but it's more likely that the
- $^{21}$  |  $^{11:33:02}$  model evolved over time as the company grew, so it
- 22 | 11:33:06 wasn't that the first version was thrown out and let's
- $23 \mid 11:33:09$  start with a new one. It was just that you just
- 24 11:33:12 refine as you get more data.
- 25 | 11:33:15 Q Did you keep hard copies of your financial

- 2 11:33:17 projections?
- 3 | 11:33:19 A There were excerpts that were included in
- $4 \mid 11:33:21$  some of the board reports, but a spreadsheet is much
- $5 \mid 11:33:28$  easier to use than a printout.
- 6 | 11:33:30 Q Right.
- 7 11:33:31 And I'm just trying to understand. You
- 8 | 11:33:34 didn't save the spreadsheets over time that you did?
- 9 11:33:38 A Of course I saved them.
- $10 \mid 11:33:42$  Q Okay. And you saved them on your office
- 11 | 11:33:45 | laptop?
- 12 11:33:45 MR. INGBER: Again, are we talking about
- 13 11:33:47 pre-acquisition?
- 14 | 11:33:47 MR. VERRILLI: Yes, just pre -- I'm sorry.
- 15 11:33:49 Pre-acquisition, yes.
- 16 11:33:51 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. As far as saving,
- 17 | 11:33:54 do you mean the actual model that's being refined over
- 18 | 11:33:58 time, or snapshots of the model?
- 19 11:34:00 MR. VERRILLI: The snapshots of the model.
- 20 11:34:03 THE WITNESS: No, not necessarily.
- 21 11:34:05 MR. VERRILLI: Q. So you would erase the
- 22 11:34:08 financial projections that you made --
- 23 11:34:10 A No.
- 24 | 11:34:10 Q -- in January once you got to February or
- 25 11:34:15 March; is that what you're saying?

- $2 \mid 11:34:15$  A No, we would refine.
- 3 11:34:17 MR. INGBER: Objection; misstates the
- 4 11:34:18 witness's testimony.
- 5 11:34:19 THE WITNESS: We wouldn't erase. We would
- $6 \mid 11:34:21$  refine. Again, as you get more data, we would add
- $7 \mid 11:34:25$  that to the model.
- 8 11:34:25 MR. VERRILLI: Q. I just want to get
- 9 | 11:34:26 clarity, Mr. Hurley. You did not maintain a
- $10 \mid 11:34:30$  historical projection of what your projections were at
- 11 | 11:34:33 various points in time?
- 12 11:34:34 A No, because the projections are refined over
- $13 \mid 11:34:37$  time as you get data.
- 14 11:34:39 O Sure.
- 15 | 11:34:40 But it wasn't relevant to you to know in June
- 16 | 11:34:44 how accurate your predictions in January had been?
- 17 | 11:34:49 A Not necessarily.
- 18 11:34:51 Q So you just erased them?
- 19 11:34:52 MR. INGBER: Objection; asked and answered.
- 20 11:34:54 THE WITNESS: We didn't erase. We refined
- 21 11:34:56 as we got more data.
- 22 11:34:58 MR. INGBER: Mischaracterizes the witness's
- 23 | 11:35:00 testimony.
- 24 11:35:00 THE WITNESS: We got better projections.
- 25 | 11:35:02 MR. VERRILLI: Right.

- 2 11:35:02 Q And so you overwrote the old data?
- 3 11:35:04 MR. INGBER: Objection; asked and answered;
- $4 \mid 11:35:06$  mischaracterizes the witness's testimony.
- 5 | 11:35:08 Go ahead.
- 6 11:35:09 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Again, we just refined
- $7 \mid 11:35:11$  them and then tried to improve them.
- 8 11:35:12 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, would refining them,
- $9 \mid 11:35:16$  as you are using that word, include overriding the
- 10 11:35:20 hold data in the spreadsheet?
- 11 11:35:26 A It's possible that -- well, of course when
- 12 11:35:29 you get more information, if you learn that one thing
- 13 11:35:32 is -- is wrong, and it's not accurate, then you remove
- $14 \mid 11:35:35$  that from the model, and you add the new, better
- 15 11:35:38 information to give you a better forecast.
- 16 | 11:35:41 Q And you wouldn't save anywhere in any form
- 17 11:35:44 the old information?
- 18 11:35:48 MR. INGBER: Objection; asked and answered.
- 19 11:35:50 THE WITNESS: Yeah. You refine the model.
- 20 11:35:53 You get the better model. You don't keep the old
- 21 | 11:35:56 model around.
- 22 11:35:56 MR. VERRILLI: Q. When you created these
- 23 | 11:35:58 financial projections, did you make any backup copies?
- 24 11:36:03 MR. INGBER: Objection; vague.
- 25 | 11:36:04 THE WITNESS: Again, I saved it to my local

- 2 11:36:12 machine.
- 3 | 11:36:13 MR. VERRILLI: Q. And were you working in
- 4 11:36:15 Microsoft Excel?
- 5 11:36:17 A Yeah.
- 6 11:36:18 Q And how frequently did you do financial
- 7 | 11:36:21 projections?
- 8 | 11:36:27 A I mean --
- 9 11:36:28 MR. INGBER: Again, just focusing
- 10 | 11:36:29 pre-acquisition?
- 11 11:36:29 MR. VERRILLI: Yes.
- 12 11:36:31 THE WITNESS: Okay. It was one of my many
- $13 \mid 11:36:35$  duties. It depends what time, what time period. Over
- 14 11:36:42 time, I focused more and more on finance and
- 15 | 11:36:45 operations.
- 16 11:36:46 MR. VERRILLI: O. Well --
- 17 | 11:36:47 A Again, it was -- over time, the model also
- $18 \mid 11:36:50$  got better, so it was just continual refinements.
- 19 11:36:55 Q And starting in January 2006 through the
- 20 | 11:37:04 period of the acquisition by Google --
- 21 11:37:06 A Yes.
- 22 | 11:37:06 Q -- did you do financial projections on --
- 23 | 11:37:08 more frequently than once a month?
- 24 11:37:15 A Certainly once a month to -- for the board
- 25 | 11:37:18 reports and also to measure the -- the data that we

- $^{2}$  |  $^{11:37:21}$  got from the previous month to include that in the
- 3 11:37:24 model.
- 4 11:37:24 Q So at least once a month?
- 5 11:37:32 A Yes.
- 6 11:37:32 Q You did them for the board reports?
- 7 11:37:35 A Yes.
- 8 11:37:35 Q And then I take it you did them also for
- $9 \mid 11:37:39$  other reasons in addition to the board reports?
- 10 11:37:43 MR. INGBER: Objection; assumes facts not in
- 11 11:37:45 evidence.
- 12 11:37:45 THE WITNESS: We did it for the company to --
- $13 \mid 11:37:52$  I mean, to project where the -- how the site was
- 14 | 11:37:58 growing --
- 15 | 11:37:58 MR. VERRILLI: O. And --
- 16 11:37:59 A -- what the company was up to.
- 17 11:38:00 Q -- and you maintained no historical record of
- 18 | 11:38:03 your projections from month to month? That's what
- 19 | 11:38:06 you're testifying to?
- 20 11:38:07 MR. INGBER: Objection to form; asked and
- 21 11:38:09 answered several times.
- 22 11:38:10 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Again, the model was
- 23 | 11:38:14 refined, and each month we would measure the stocks,
- $24 \mid 11:38:23$  and then insert those as fact, and then the
- 25 11:38:26 forward-looking projection we would refine over time.

- $2 \mid 11:38:28$  So the historic data was captured in that
- $^{3}\mid^{11:38:31}$  model. It was just that the model would continue to
- $4 \mid 11:38:34$  shape and evolve over time.
- 5 11:38:35 MR. VERRILLI: Okay.
- 6 11:38:40 Q Mr. Hurley, can you explain to me how one
- 7 11:38:45 would go about uploading a video clip onto YouTube?
- 8 11:38:51 A Sure. Just --
- 9 11:38:52 MR. INGBER: Objection; vague as to time.
- 10 11:38:56 MR. VERRILLI: Well, let's -- okay. Let's
- $11 \mid 11:38:58$  make the time frame from the period between
- $12 \mid 11:39:02$  January 1st, 2006, and the time of the acquisition.
- 13 11:39:05 During that time frame, can you explain to me
- 14 11:39:08 how one would go about uploading a video clip onto
- 15 | 11:39:12 YouTube?
- 16 11:39:12 A Sure. I can give you the general work flow.
- 17 11:39:16 You create an account on YouTube. You verify
- $18 \mid 11:39:22$  your e-mail address for that account. You go to our
- $^{19}$   $|^{11:39:26}$  upload screen, click the upload button, select the
- $20 \mid 11:39:32$  video file you want to upload, include the metadata
- $21 \mid 11:39:39$  fields that we ask for, a description, title, tags,
- $22 \mid 11:39:44$  category, and then hit upload.
- 23 11:39:48 Q And that's all it takes to upload?
- 24 11:39:51 A Generally, yeah, pretty much.
- 25 11:39:52 Q And did you ever upload videos to YouTube

- $^{2}\mid^{12:13:29}$  plan for a start-up is hardly planned, because things
- $^{3}\mid^{12:13:33}$  change so quickly. It's more reactive.
- 4 | 12:13:35 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, you had a business
- $5 \mid 12:13:38 \mod e 1$  at least that you were pursuing; right?
- 6 12:13:41 A Again, the models at that time were so -- it
- $7 \mid 12:13:47$  was just, again, best guesses and they were just
- 8 12:13:50 quesses.
- 9 12:13:52 Q Well, you -- one possibility was to pursue an
- 10 12:14:02 advertising based business model; correct?
- 11 12:14:04 A Yes.
- 12 12:14:04 Q Do you have any others?
- 13 12:14:12 A That was the primary. I don't recall any
- 14 12:14:15 other specific plans.
- $15 \mid 12:14:16$  Q So the only one you can recall is an
- 16 12:14:20 advertising based business model?
- 17 12:14:22 A Well, first and foremost we were focused on
- 18 | 12:14:25 creating a great user experience, so it's very
- 19 12:14:29 secondary. That may sound odd creating a business and
- 20 12:14:34 not worrying about first and foremost money, but that
- $21 \mid 12:14:39$  was the case. I mean, we were really trying to build
- $22 \mid 12:14:43$  a great experience for the user.
- 23 12:14:44 Q And you didn't care about the money?
- 24 12:14:47 A Not in -- initially, no.
- 25 | 12:14:49 Q When did you start caring about the money?

- $2 \mid 12:14:51$  MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 3 12:14:52 THE WITNESS: Well, it could be viewed that
- $4 \mid 12:14:58 \text{ we}$  -- we are now just starting to focus on money.
- 5 | 12:15:03 Even after the acquisition, Google allowed us to
- $6 \mid 12:15:07$  continue to focus on the user and to create a great
- 7 | 12:15:10 user experience.
- 8 12:15:11 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, your brother was
- $9 \mid 12:15:12$  focused on the money in that e-mail on August 17th,
- 10 | 12:15:16 2005; wasn't he?
- 11 | 12:15:17 A No; he was focused on a successful company.
- 12 | 12:15:19 Q "A multi-billion dollar success" is what it
- 13 | 12:15:23 said; right?
- 14 | 12:15:23 MR. INGBER: Objection; asked and answered,
- 15 | 12:15:25 Don.
- 16 12:15:26 THE WITNESS: Creating a great product that
- 17 | 12:15:28 leads to success.
- 18 | 12:15:29 MR. VERRILLI: Q. And as far as you know, in
- $19 \mid 12:15:40 \mid 2005$ , no one employed at YouTube was thinking about
- 20 12:15:45 getting acquired?
- 21 12:15:46 A In -- at what time period?
- 22 12:15:48 O In 2005.
- 23 12:15:50 A No.
- 24 12:15:54 Q So it would surprise you to learn --
- 25 | 12:15:56 A Not to my knowledge.

- $2 \mid 12:15:56$  Q -- so it would surprise you to learn that
- $^{3}\mid^{12:15:58}$  your brother was actually communicating with other
- 4 12:16:00 YouTube employees in 2005 about getting acquired?
- 5 12:16:03 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 6 12:16:05 He testified that the answer was no, not to
- $7 \mid 12:16:08 \text{ his knowledge.}$
- 8 | 12:16:08 MR. VERRILLI: So I asked him whether he'd be
- 9 | 12:16:11 surprised if that were the case.
- 10 | 12:16:14 THE WITNESS: Again, we had a -- a similar
- $11 \mid 12:16:17$  vision of focusing on the users and creating a great
- 12 | 12:16:20 product. Anything like that, the money, any kind of
- 13 | 12:16:26 acquisition was very secondary and not at the
- 14 12:16:32 forefront of our thinking.
- 15 12:16:32 MR. VERRILLI: Okay.
- 16 12:16:35 Q Well, this -- we're talking about the
- 17 | 12:16:41 advertising based business model.
- 18 12:16:44 A Uh-huh.
- 19 12:16:44 Q Describe to me what an advertising based
- $20 \mid 12:16:47$  business model is as you understand it.
- $^{21}$  |  $^{12:16:52}$  A As I understand it, similar websites, you get
- $22 \mid 12:17:00$  traffic, people come to you, the site, and then you
- $23 \mid 12:17:03$  can insert ads onto those pages and -- and earn
- 24 12:17:07 revenue from those ads.
- 25 | 12:17:09 Q So one goal of an advertising based business

- $2 \mid 12:17:13 \mod el$  is to build up a large community of users of the
- $3 \mid 12:17:18 \text{ website; right?}$
- 4 12:17:23 A Yeah.
- 5 12:17:24 Q Okay. And another goal in an advertising
- 6 12:17:29 based business model is to entice advertisers to place
- 7 | 12:17:36 ads on the website in order to earn revenue; right?
- 8 12:17:44 A That's one way. It's not necessarily the
- $9 \mid 12:17:47 \text{ way, and that's not the way we initially had it.}$
- 10 12:17:49 Q Okay. What -- how did you initially have it?
- 11 | 12:17:52 A Just with the various ad networks online that
- 12 | 12:17:56 you can employ. It's not that you have a direct sales
- 13 | 12:17:59 force selling ads for your site. They just auto
- 14 | 12:18:02 insert those ads.
- $15 \mid 12:18:03$  Q But you did have a sales force selling ads
- 16 | 12:18:06 for your site by the second quarter of 2006; correct?
- 17 | 12:18:09 A That's right.
- 18 | 12:18:09 Q And you had planned well before the second
- 19 | 12:18:12 quarter of 2006 to have a sales force selling ads
- 20 | 12:18:16 directly by the second quarter of 2006; correct?
- 21 | 12:18:19 MR. INGBER: Objection to form; vague and
- 22 | 12:18:20 ambiguous.
- 23 12:18:22 What do you mean by "well before"?
- 24 12:18:25 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't recall
- $25 \mid 12:18:26$  specifically when we planned that, to add a sales

```
2 12:18:33 force.
```

- 3 12:18:34 MR. VERRILLI: Q. You don't recall?
- 4 12:18:36 A No. Initially it was a -- it -- it would --
- $5 \mid 12:18:42$  it would be easier for us if we didn't have a sales
- $6 \mid 12:18:45$  force, if we could just use the ad networks that would
- $^{7}$  |  $^{12:18:49}$  automatically do things on their own.
- 8 | 12:18:53 Q So going back to Exhibit 1, your resume, one
- 9 12:18:57 thing that it says is that you prepared and delivered
- 10 | 12:19:00 due diligence for the following transactions, and one
- 11 | 12:19:03 of them is Series A and B financing; do you see that
- 12 | 12:19:06 there?
- 13 12:19:07 A Uh-huh.
- 14 12:19:07 Q That was with Sequoia; correct?
- 15 | 12:19:10 A That's right.
- 16 12:19:10 Q And then it says "Equipment loan and lease";
- 17 | 12:19:13 do you see that?
- 18 12:19:14 A That's right.
- 19 12:19:14 Q That was with Triple Point; correct?
- 20 12:19:16 A That's right.
- 21 | 12:19:16 Q You don't recall making representations to
- 22 | 12:19:19 Triple Point that you had plans to have a direct
- 23 | 12:19:21 advertising sales force in the field in advance of the
- 24 | 12:19:25 second quarter of 2006?
- 25 12:19:28 A I don't remember specifically. Again, I

- 2 | 12:29:31 reviewing the videos before they were uploaded?
- $^{3}$   $|_{12:29:34}$  A Not before. They would immediately go live
- $4 \mid 12:29:38$  to the site, and that was actually one of the reasons
- $^{5}$  |  $^{12:29:43}$  that we introduced the community flagging, is that
- 6 12:29:48 they may upload -- I would go to bed at night. I was
- $7 \mid 12:29:51$  the only guy doing this. Somebody may upload a video
- $8 \mid 12:29:54$  in the middle of the night that was inappropriate, and
- 9 12:29:56 then in the morning this video may show up on one of
- $10 \mid 12:30:00$  the most viewed pages, but there wasn't an easy way to
- 11 | 12:30:04 -- I would have to work through all the way back until
- $12 \mid 12:30:06$  the middle of the night to be able to find that and
- 13 12:30:08 take that video down.
- 14 | 12:30:12 So the community flagging was an ability for
- $^{15}$  |  $^{12:30:15}$  people to flag it and that it would automatically go
- 16 | 12:30:18 into a queue.
- 17 | 12:30:21 Q But you -- you were reviewing -- I just want
- 18 12:30:24 to get the facts clear. Until the end of
- 19 | 12:30:28 November 2005 you were reviewing every video that was
- 20 12:30:34 unloaded onto the site?
- 21 | 12:30:35 A Well, it depends. Reviewing, I would look at
- 22 | 12:30:38 thumbnails of videos. I wasn't actually watching
- $23 \mid 12:30:41$  videos. It was -- it would be impossible to do that.
- 24 | 12:30:44 Q Did you review a thumbnail of every video
- 25 12:30:47 that was uploaded to the site?

- $^{2}$  |  $^{12:30:52}$  A Yeah, I would do my best. I was the only one
- $3 \mid 12:30:54 \text{ doing it.}$
- 4 | 12:30:55 Q It must have been an -- must have been a real
- $^{5}$  |  $^{12:30:57}$  job, but -- but I just want to get clear.
- 6 12:31:02 That's what you were attempting to do, was to
- 7 | 12:31:03 review a thumbnail of every video uploaded to the
- 8 | 12:31:07 site?
- $9 \mid 12:31:07$  A It was very ad hoc. Again, just looking at
- $10 \mid 12:31:10$  thumbnails, and if I saw some bare flesh, then I would
- 11 | 12:31:14 remove it, but outside of sort of spotting porn,
- 12 | 12:31:18 trying to catch other kind of inappropriate videos was
- $13 \mid 12:31:21$  very difficult to do. They would go through if they
- 14 | 12:31:25 were, you know, violence videos, stuff like that.
- 15 | 12:31:31 You can't see that with just a thumbnail, so
- 16 12:31:33 it would go live. Again, that's why we started
- 17 | 12:31:37 building these tools so that the community could help
- 18 | 12:31:39 police it.
- 19 12:31:40 So we looked to other sites, similar to
- 20 12:31:44 online sites, like Craigslist and sort of these open
- $21 \mid 12:31:48$  forums and what they had done is sort of best
- $22 \mid 12:31:50$  practices to -- to rely on the community to be able to
- $23 \mid 12:31:55$  help keep -- keep the community itself safe.
- 24 | 12:31:58 Q Did you look at Google Video's practices as a
- 25 | 12:32:01 model?

- 2 12:47:21 Q You've just been handed a document,
- $3 \mid 12:47:24$  Mr. Hurley. It's been marked Exhibit 7.
- $4 \mid 12:47:27$  Could you take a look at it, please.
- 5 12:47:29 A Uh-huh. Okay.
- 6 12:48:06 Q This is an e-mail from you; is that correct?
- 7 12:48:14 A That's correct.
- 8 12:48:14 Q And it was sent on the 24th of November 2005;
- 9 12:48:20 correct?
- 10 12:48:21 A Yes.
- 11 | 12:48:21 Q And --
- 12 | 12:48:23 MR. INGBER: Just for the record, there's
- $13 \mid 12:48:24$  actually two e-mails in this chain.
- 14 12:48:26 MR. VERRILLI: Thank you. The e-mail at the
- $^{15}$  |  $^{12:48:28}$  top half of the page is the one we're referring to.
- 16 | 12:48:31 Q You understand that, Mr. Hurley; right?
- 17 | 12:48:34 A Yes.
- $18 \mid 12:48:34$  Q And the -- the e-mail was sent on the
- 19 | 12:48:40 24th of November; correct?
- 20 12:48:42 A Yeah.
- 21 | 12:48:43 Q That was the day before the Thanksgiving
- 22 | 12:48:45 holiday; right?
- 23 12:48:46 A Yes, yeah.
- 24 12:48:47 Q Right.
- 25 12:48:49 And you are sending a message here to other

- $^{2}$  |  $^{12:48:57}$  YouTube employees who are going to help you review
- $^{3}$  |  $^{12:49:01}$  videos over the holiday weekend; correct?
- $4 \mid 12:49:03$  A That's correct.
- $5 \mid 12:49:03$  Q Okay. And you're giving them instructions
- 6 12:49:06 about what to do; correct?
- 7 12:49:08 A Yes.
- 8 12:49:08 Q Okay. And one of the instructions you give
- $9 \mid 12:49:16$  them says "As far as copyright stuff is concerned, be
- $10 \mid 12:49:20$  on the lookout for Family Guy, South Park and
- 11 12:49:25 full-length anime episodes."
- 12 | 12:49:29 Do I have that pronunciation correct by the
- 13 | 12:49:31 way?
- 14 12:49:31 A Sure. I don't know. Anime.
- 15 | 12:49:36 Q But that's one of the instructions you gave
- 16 12:49:38 to the reviewers; right?
- 17 12:49:42 A Yes.
- 18 | 12:49:42 Q And so when a reviewer found a Family Guy
- $19 \mid 12:49:49$  episode, what was the reviewer supposed to do?
- 20 12:49:53 A I assume try to take it down.
- 21 | 12:49:58 Q And when the reviewer found a South Park
- $22 \mid 12:50:01$  episode, what was the reviewer supposed to do?
- 23 12:50:04 A Try to take it down.
- 24 | 12:50:05 Q And when the reviewer found a full-length
- $25 \mid 12:50:09$  anime episode, what was the reviewer supposed to do?

- $2 \mid 12:50:13$  A Try to take it down.
- $3 \mid 12:50:14$  Q Okay. But it was -- but the instruction goes
- $4 \mid 12:50:17$  on to say that "music videos and news programs are
- $5 \mid 12:50:21$  fine to approve"; right?
- 6 12:50:25 A Uh-huh.
- 7 12:50:25 MR. INGBER: Give an audible response.
- 8 12:50:27 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 9 12:50:32 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Can I ask you to go back
- $10 \mid 12:50:35$  and look at Exhibit 2, please. Let me know when
- 11 | 12:50:51 you're ready.
- 12 12:50:52 A Okay.
- 13 | 12:51:00 Q Are you ready?
- 14 12:51:01 A Yeah, I'm ready.
- $15 \mid 12:51:02$  Q Okay. So this is an e-mail that you sent
- 16 12:51:04 approximately a month and a half earlier; correct?
- 17 | 12:51:07 A That's correct.
- 18 | 12:51:08 Q Okay. And the subject is "Admin
- 19 12:51:12 Improvements"; correct?
- 20 12:51:14 A That's right.
- 21 | 12:51:14 Q What does "Admin" mean?
- 22 | 12:51:18 A That was the review where the queue of videos
- 23 12:51:24 when we would look at the thumbnails would be.
- 24 12:51:27 Q Okay. Can you go down to this number four
- 25 | 12:51:32 here? You see it --

- $2\mid 14:36:26$  you were involved in the review process, you never
- 3 14:36:29 relied exclusively on the community flagging to
- 4 14:36:32 prevent pornography from appearing on the site;
- 5 14:36:37 correct?
- 6 14:36:38 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 7 | 14:36:39 THE WITNESS: I think as I had said before,
- $8 \mid 14:36:41$  we didn't have community flagging at the outset, so of
- 9 14:36:46 course we were just trying, ad hoc, trying to control
- 10 | 14:36:51 the site.
- 11 | 14:36:52 MR. VERRILLI: Q. But you continued when --
- 12 14:36:57 during the time when you were involved in review,
- 13 | 14:37:00 YouTube continued to review proactively for
- 14 14:37:04 pornography even after you had the community flagging
- $15 \mid 14:37:07$  system in place; correct?
- 16 14:37:12 A Not to my knowledge.
- 17 14:37:16 Is this after I stopped doing any kind of
- 18 | 14:37:18 reviews?
- 19 14:37:19 Q When you were doing it.
- 20 14:37:20 A When I was doing it?
- 21 14:37:22 Q When you were doing it.
- 22 | 14:37:27 A Not to my knowledge. I know we stopped
- $23 \mid 14:37:30$  reviewing all videos, and we had introduced a flag and
- $24 \mid 14:37:36$  reviewed the flag videos.
- 25 | 14:37:38 Q And did YouTube ever implement the flagging

- $2 \mid 15:17:58$  MR. INGBER: Hold on. I don't want you to
- 3 | 15:18:00 quess.
- 4 15:18:00 THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. Yeah. Yeah, I'm
- $5 \mid 15:18:04$  not sure. It may or might -- may not actually be part
- 6 |15:18:08| of private videos.
- 7 15:18:10 MR. VERRILLI: Q. The fact is that YouTube
- $8 \mid 15:18:15$  proactively reviewed every private video uploaded to
- 9 | 15:18:18 make sure there was no inappropriate content; correct?
- 10 15:18:20 MR. INGBER: Objection; vague as to time.
- 11 | 15:18:24 THE WITNESS: Initially we reviewed any
- 12 | 15:18:26 video.
- 13 | 15:18:26 MR. VERRILLI: Q. And after YouTube stopped
- 14 | 15:18:28 reviewing any video, it continued to review all
- 15 | 15:18:31 private videos uploaded to ensure there was no
- 16 | 15:18:34 inappropriate content; correct?
- $17 \mid 15:18:39$  A Again, I'm not sure as far as timing. I
- $18 \mid 15:18:43$  transitioned those duties over to Heather and the
- 19 15:18:46 other team members.
- 20 | 15:18:49 Q But you created a document that specifically
- 21 | 15:18:51 says that all private videos will be screened for
- 22 | 15:18:54 inappropriate content; didn't you?
- 23 15:18:56 MR. INGBER: Objection.
- 24 15:18:57 Show him the document if you feel it will
- 25 | 15:19:02 refresh his recollection.

- $^{2}$  |  $^{15:34:05}$  I'm not -- I'm not surprised. It's just that I don't
- $^{3}$   $|_{15:34:11}$  specifically remember doing it.
- 4 15:34:12 MR. VERRILLI: Q. You don't have any reason
- $5 \mid 15:34:13$  to think that this is incorrect; do you?
- 6 15:34:16 A No.
- 7 15:34:20 Q Okay. Could we give the witness Exhibit 14,
- 8 | 15:34:24 please.
- 9 15:34:39 Here you go. 14.
- 10 15:34:42 MR. INGBER: Is this the document with the
- 11 | 15:34:43 subject line "Board Preso"?
- 12 15:34:49 MR. VERRILLI: No, I'm sorry. I got ahead of
- 13 | 15:34:51 myself.
- 14 | 15:34:51 MR. INGBER: I think we're going on to 14 and
- 15 15:34:53 heading to 17 if you're marking a new 16?
- 16 15:34:57 MR. VERRILLI: No, I think I jumped ahead,
- $17 \mid 15:35:00$  because I premarked this. That's what I think is
- $18 \mid 15:35:03$  causing the confusion here. I think we are at 15.
- 19 15:35:05 MR. INGBER: Yeah, you're right.
- 20 15:35:06 MR. VERRILLI: And this document is 14. It's
- $^{21}$   $|^{15:35:08}$  a document, the tag line says "June Results." Okay.
- 22 | 15:35:12 It's my -- I'm the source of that confusion.
- 23 | 15:35:22 MR. INGBER: This is 14.
- 24 | 15:35:44 Don, which -- what's the Bates number on the
- 25 | 15:35:46 document that you've labeled Exhibit 13?

- 2 | 15:35:49 MR. VERRILLI: Exhibit 13?
- 3 | 15:35:50 MR. INGBER: Yes.
- 4 15:35:51 MR. VERRILLI: Exhibit 13 is the "Board
- 5 15:35:55 Preso."
- 6 15:35:56 MR. INGBER: Okay.
- 7 | 15:35:56 MR. VERRILLI: It's 00762173.
- 8 15:36:03 MR. INGBER: Okay. Got it.
- 9 15:36:05 MR. VERRILLI: Okay.
- 10 | 15:36:06 Q Mr. Hurley, have you had a chance to review
- 11 | 15:36:08 this document?
- 12 15:36:09 A Yes.
- 13 | 15:36:09 Q And the first page of this document is an
- 14 | 15:36:13 e-mail, and it's from you to another person at
- 15 | 15:36:17 YouTube; correct?
- 16 | 15:36:18 A Uh-huh, that's right.
- 17 | 15:36:19 Q And it's dated June -- forgive me, and it's
- 18 | 15:36:23 dated August 18th, 2006; correct?
- 19 15:36:29 A August 18th, yeah.
- 20 | 15:36:30 Q Okay. And it attaches -- it has an
- 21 15:36:35 attachment; correct?
- 22 15:36:36 A That's correct.
- 23 15:36:36 Q And did you prepare this attachment?
- 24 15:36:39 A Yes.
- 25 | 15:36:39 Q Okay. And you're familiar with it?

- 2 15:36:42 A Yes.
- 3 | 15:36:42 Q Okay. I just want you to explain some things
- $^4$  | 15:36:49 to me about this document, and I'm going to ask if we
- $5 \mid 15:36:52$  could start on Bates numbered page 0073364.
- 6 | 15:37:09 A Okay.
- 7 15:37:10 Q There is a column to the left that says
- 8 | 15:37:12 "date"; right?
- 9 15:37:13 A Yeah.
- $10 \mid 15:37:14$  Q Is that the date on which the particular
- 11 | 15:37:16 advertisement ran?
- 12 15:37:17 A Yes.
- 13 | 15:37:17 Q Okay. And the next column says "Channel";
- 14 | 15:37:21 right?
- 15 | 15:37:22 A Yeah.
- 16 15:37:22 O What does that mean?
- 17 | 15:37:24 A Just the ad unit on the site depending on
- $18 \mid 15:37:32$  which page it was on.
- 19 15:37:33 Q Okay. So let me just ask some questions so I
- 20 | 15:37:35 can get clarification as to what this means.
- 21 | 15:37:37 For example, on 6/1/2006 it says "Channel"
- 22 | 15:37:43 Watch Top." Does that mean the advertisement appeared
- $23 \mid 15:37:46$  at the top of the watch page?
- 24 | 15:37:48 A Yes.
- $25 \mid 15:37:48$  Q Okay. And the next one, 6/1/2006, says

- $^{2}$  |  $^{15:37:52}$  "Results Top." Does that mean that the advertisement
- $^{3}\mid^{15:37:55}$  appeared at the top of the results page?
- 4 15:37:57 A The top of the search results page, I
- 5 | 15:37:59 believe.
- 6 15:37:59 Q Okay. I'm just trying to understand what --
- $^{7}$  |  $^{15:38:02}$  what you meant by the words you used here.
- 8 15:38:04 A Uh-huh.
- 9 15:38:04 Q That's what it means --
- 10 15:38:06 A Yeah.
- $11 \mid 15:38:06 \quad Q \quad -- \text{ search results page?}$
- 12 | 15:38:08 Okay. And below it, I'm not going to go
- $13 \mid 15:38:12$  through each one. I just want to gain a general
- 14 | 15:38:15 understanding of what these terms mean.
- 16 | 15:38:20 the ad appeared on the right-hand side of the search
- 17 | 15:38:24 results page --
- 18 15:38:25 A True.
- 19 15:38:26 Q -- is that correct?
- 20 15:38:26 A Yeah.
- 21 | 15:38:27 Q Okay. And on the next one, it says "Browse
- 22 15:38:31 Right"; what does that mean?
- 23 | 15:38:35 A Those are the browse pages of most viewed or
- 24 | 15:38:38 most discussed videos.
- 25 | 15:38:39 Q Okay. And then "Channels Top," what does

- $2 \mid 15:38:46 \text{ that mean?}$
- 3 | 15:38:48 A I believe that's your own YouTube channel
- $^{4}$   $|^{15:38:51}$  when you create your account. That's sort of like
- $^{5}\mid^{15:38:55}$  similar to your profile on other sites.
- 6 | 15:38:57 Q Okay. How about "Members Top"? What does
- 7 15:39:00 that mean?
- 8 15:39:01 A I'm not sure what that means.
- 9 | 15:39:07 Q How about "Groups Top"?
- 10 15:39:09 A I assume that's just the top of the groups
- 11 | 15:39:13 browse page.
- 12 | 15:39:13 Q How about "Tribal Top"?
- 13 | 15:39:16 A I'm not sure. We did have an ad network
- 14 15:39:22 called Tribal Fusion. I don't know why they had a
- $^{15}$  |  $^{15:39:25}$  separate unit there, what that means.
- 16 | 15:39:27 Q And the -- without going through this
- 17 | 15:39:32 document line by line, this is a summary of the
- 18 | 15:39:37 advertisements that ran on YouTube in June 2006; is
- 19 | 15:39:44 that correct?
- 20 15:39:44 A Yeah.
- $21 \mid 15:39:44$  Q And the data on the right-hand column is
- $22 \mid 15:39:48$  basically measuring how well the advertisements did in
- $23 \mid 15:39:50$  terms of what revenue they generated, how much
- 24 | 15:39:53 attention they got, that sort of thing; right?
- 25 | 15:39:55 MR. INGBER: Objection; vague.

- 2 15:39:56 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it shows clicks and
- $3 \mid 15:39:58 \text{ earnings.}$
- 4 | 15:39:59 MR. VERRILLI: Okay.
- $5 \mid 15:40:00$  Q And what this -- one of the things that this
- 6 | 15:40:03 document tells us is that in June 2006, YouTube was
- $7 \mid 15:40:07$  running ads on the watch pages; right?
- 8 15:40:12 A Yes.
- $9 \mid 15:40:12$  Q And that in June 2006, it was running ads on
- $10 \mid 15:40:16$  the results pages; correct?
- 11 15:40:18 A Yes.
- 12 15:40:18 Q And in June 2006, it was running ads on the
- 13 | 15:40:22 browse pages; correct?
- 14 15:40:23 A Yes.
- 15 | 15:40:23 Q And in June 2006, it was running
- 16 | 15:40:27 advertisements on the channels pages; correct?
- 17 | 15:40:29 A Correct.
- $18 \mid 15:40:30$  Q And in June 2006, it was running ads on the
- 19 | 15:40:33 members pages; correct?
- $20 \mid 15:40:36$  A Yeah, whatever those members' names are, yes.
- $21 \mid 15:40:41$  Q Okay. And so any of the pages listed in this
- $22 \mid 15:40:43$  document, it is a page on which advertising ran on
- 23 | 15:40:49 YouTube in June 2006; correct?
- 24 15:40:53 A Yes.
- 25 | 15:40:53 Q Okay. And I don't know if I asked you about

- $2 \mid 15:40:56$  this one. I'm sorry.
- 3 15:40:57 "6/1/2006 Home Right," what does that mean?
- $4 \mid 15:41:03$  A I assume it's the home page.
- 5 15:41:05 Q Okay. So the right-hand side of the home
- 6 15:41:08 page, is that what that would mean?
- 7 15:41:11 A Yeah, I can't be sure.
- 8 15:41:15 Q Well, you wrote the document; didn't you?
- $9 \mid 15:41:18$  A This is a dump that Alex would dump out of, I
- $10 \mid 15:41:22$  believe, double click. So this is a spreadsheet that
- $11 \mid 15:41:26$  he created. I created the -- the top
- 12 | 15:41:31 spreadsheet.
- $13 \mid 15:41:35$  Q Okay. Let me mark this as exhibit....
- 14 | 15:42:02 (Document marked Hurley Exhibit 16
- 15 | 15:42:03 for identification.)
- 16 15:42:27 MR. VERRILLI: Q. I'm just going to ask you
- $17 \mid 15:42:37$  a question about the first page, but you should feel
- $18 \mid 15:42:39$  free to take all the time you want to look at the
- 19 | 15:42:42 document.
- 20 15:43:42 A Okay.
- $^{21}$   $^{15:43:43}$  Q Okay. Exhibit 16 is -- the first page of it
- $22 \mid 15:43:55$  consists of an e-mail chain, and the first e-mail
- 23 | 15:44:01 listed is an e-mail from you to Sean Dempsey; right?
- 24 15:44:06 A That's right.
- 25 | 15:44:06 Q Who's Sean Dempsey?

Page 156 1 HURLEY 15:44:09 I believe he's on the corporate development 15:44:11 team at Google. 15:44:15 Okay. Did you interact with him during the 15:44:17 5 course of due diligence on the Google acquisition of 15:44:21 YouTube? 15:44:21 Very briefly. We may -- this may be one of 15:44:25 like two e-mails we exchanged. 15:44:27 Okay. You were involved in that due Q 15:44:29 10 diligence process though; correct? 15:44:33 11 Α Yes. 15:44:33 12 Okay. And it's CCed to Storm Duncan; 0 15:44:38 13 correct? 15:44:38 Uh-huh. 14 Α 15:44:38 15 And who's he? 0 15:44:40 16 I don't recall who Storm is, but he looks 15:44:42 like a banker from Credit Suisse. 17 15:44:47 18 Okay. And in this message to Sean Dempsey, Q 15:44:51 19 you were answering some questions that he posed to 15:44:53 20 you; correct? 15:44:56 21 Yes. 15:44:56 22 And item number three in your answer says 15:44:59 23 "Yes, we are running ROS ads on both the search, watch 15:45:03 2.4 and browse pages." That's what it says; right?

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

That's what it says.

15:45:06

25

Α

805 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022 (212)705-8585

	7	Page 157
	1	HURLEY
15:45:07	2	Q What's "ROS" stand for?
15:45:10	3	A Just Run of Site.
15:45:12	4	Q What is a run-of-site ad?
15:45:17	5	A Jeez, I don't know the specific definition.
15:45:45	6	Yeah, I don't know the specific definition.
15:45:48	7	Q Did you know it at the time you wrote this
15:45:50	8	e-mail?
15:45:51	9	A Yeah, I guess if I was
15:45:55	10	MR. INGBER: Don't guess.
15:45:56	11	THE WITNESS: Well, yeah, I don't recall.
15:46:04	12	MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, whatever a
15:46:08	13	run-of-site ad is, you're confirming in this e-mail
15:46:11	14	that as of October 2006 those ads were running on the
15:46:15	15	search watch and browse pages; correct?
15:46:17	16	A That's what it says.
15:46:18	17	Q And it would be important for you to be
15:46:20	18	accurate in conveying this information to Google as
15:46:23	19	part of the due diligence for this deal; correct?
15:46:26	20	A Yes.
15:46:26	21	Q So it's safe to assume that this was an
15:46:30	22	accurate statement of what YouTube was, in fact, doing
15:46:32	23	in October 2006 with respect to run-of-site ads;
15:46:36	24	correct?
15:46:36	25	MR. INGBER: Objection to form.

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

805 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022 (212)705-8585

- 2 15:46:37 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Again, I don't recall
- $^{3}\mid^{15:46:45}$  specifically, but that's what the e-mail says, so I
- 4 15:46:48 have no reason to believe it's false.
- 5 15:46:50 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, my question to you
- 6  $\mid$  15:46:52 is whether -- I believe my question to you is -- I
- $7 \mid 15:46:55$  apologize if I'm confused here -- was whether it was
- $8 \mid 15:46:59$  important to be accurate in conveying this information
- 9 15:47:04 on Exhibit 16 to Google in the course of this due
- 10 | 15:47:07 diligence process.
- 11 | 15:47:08 MR. INGBER: Asked and answered.
- 12 | 15:47:11 MR. VERRILLI: Q. And what was the answer?
- 13 15:47:12 A Yes.
- 14 15:47:23 MR. VERRILLI: Okay. Could we mark this
- $15 \mid 15:47:25$  document, please, as, I guess, what, 17? Yes, 17.
- 16 15:47:35 (Document marked Hurley Exhibit 17
- 17 15:47:37 for identification.)
- 18 | 15:47:37 MR. VERRILLI: Q. We've only got a few
- $19 \mid 15:47:38$  minutes left on the tape, so after we discuss this
- 20 15:47:41 document, why don't we take a break; okay?
- 21 15:47:43 A Sure.
- 22 15:50:04 Q You ready?
- 23 15:50:06 A Okay.
- 24 15:50:06 Q Okay. The cover page of Exhibit 17 is an
- 25 | 15:50:09 e-mail from Maryrose Dunton to Micah Schaffer and

- 2 | 15:50:15 Heather Gillette; correct?
- 3 15:50:17 A That's correct.
- 4 | 15:50:18 Q It's dated January 1st, 2006, -- January
- 5 | 15:50:22 10th, 2006; correct?
- 6 15:50:23 A Yes.
- 7 15:50:23 Q Okay. It has an attachment to it; correct?
- 8 15:50:28 A That's correct.
- 9 15:50:28 Q The attachment is titled "YouTube Feature
- 10 | 15:50:33 Description"; correct?
- 11 15:50:34 A That's correct.
- 12 | 15:50:35 Q The feature name is "Admin Improvements";
- 13 | 15:50:38 correct?
- 14 15:50:38 A Correct.
- 15 | 15:50:38 Q The document lists three innovators; correct?
- 16 15:50:44 A Correct.
- 17 15:50:44 Q One of them is Brent; correct?
- 18 15:50:47 A Yes.
- 19 15:50:47 Q That's you; correct?
- 20 15:50:48 A Yes.
- 21 15:50:48 Q Okay. So you were one of the innovators of
- 22 | 15:50:51 this admin improvements feature; correct?
- 23 15:50:54 A Yes, I worked on this feature.
- 24 15:50:56 Q Okay. Do you recall doing so?
- 25 | 15:50:59 A Yes. Well, I recur -- I recall working with

- $^{2}$   $|^{15:51:09}$  lawyer -- with lawyers on this feature.
- 3 | 15:51:11 MR. INGBER: Okay. Don't -- that's fine.
- $4 \mid 15:51:13$  MR. VERRILLI: I didn't ask him anyway.
- 5 | 15:51:15 MR. INGBER: I understand. I want to caution
- $6 \mid 15:51:17$  him not to reveal any attorney-client communications.
- 7 | 15:51:20 MR. VERRILLI: Okay.
- 8 15:51:21 Q The -- you know what, in light of that, I'm
- 9 15:51:24 thinking what I'd like to do is finish my questions on
- 10 15:51:29 this. I don't know if it's going to run over the
- $11 \mid 15:51:31$  tape, but I would like to finish my questions on this
- 12 | 15:51:34 document, and then we can take a break; okay?
- 13 15:51:37 A Okay.
- 14 15:51:37 Q So what I'd like to first direct your
- $15 \mid 15:51:39$  attention to with respect to this document,
- 16 | 15:51:44 Mr. Hurley, is the item number one on the page,
- 17 | 15:51:50 "Screening of Only Flagged/Private Videos"; you see
- 18 | 15:51:54 that there?
- 19 15:51:55 A Yeah.
- 20 | 15:51:55 Q This document indicates that moving forward
- $21 \mid 15:52:01$  all private videos will be screened; correct?
- 22 | 15:52:05 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 23 15:52:06 THE WITNESS: That's what the document says.
- 24 15:52:15 MR. VERRILLI: Q. And that was the policy
- $25 \mid 15:52:16$  going forward as of the time this document was

```
2 \mid 15:52:18 created; right?
```

- $3 \mid 15:52:20$  MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 4 15:52:21 THE WITNESS: Again, I didn't create this
- 5 | 15:52:25 document. I contributed to these features, but I
- $6\mid 15:52:31$  don't recall specifically. Again, I had moved on to
- $7 \mid 15:52:33$  other things. This was sort of my last project that I
- 8 | 15:52:38 was working on until I like really transitioned over
- $9 \mid 15:52:42$  to finance and operation duties. So I don't recall
- $^{10}$   $^{15:52:49}$  the specific policy going forward or....
- 11 15:52:56 MR. VERRILLI: Q. It does indicate that all
- 12 | 15:53:00 private videos will be screened; right?
- 13 | 15:53:06 A It says "Moving forward, only flagged and
- 14 | 15:53:08 private videos will be reviewed."
- $15 \mid 15:53:10$  O And then the last of the bullets there under
- 16 | 15:53:13 point one indicates that all private videos will be
- 17 | 15:53:17 screened; right?
- 18 | 15:53:23 MR. INGBER: Objection to form. The document
- 19 15:53:25 speaks for itself.
- 20 15:53:29 THE WITNESS: Break out admin into three tabs
- $^{21}$  15:53:31 with videos filtered. Private videos is one of those.
- 22 15:53:36 MR. VERRILLI: Q. So does this mean that any
- 23 | 15:53:38 video that was uploaded as a private video would
- 24 | 15:53:43 automatically be routed to admin for review?
- 25 | 15:53:47 MR. INGBER: Objection; lacks foundation.

- 2 15:53:54 THE WITNESS: Again, I don't recall. I
- $^{3}$  | 15:53:56 wasn't involved with the daily admin tool at this
- 4 | 15:54:00 point.
- 5 | 15:54:00 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, is listing you as an
- 6 | 15:54:04 innovator another embellishment?
- 7 15:54:06 MR. INGBER: Objection; argumentative.
- 8 15:54:09 THE WITNESS: Again, I -- I contributed to
- 9 15:54:10 this, but I didn't actually implement it.
- 10 15:54:12 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, did you contribute
- 11 | 15:54:14 to the decision that all private videos would be
- 12 | 15:54:16 screened?
- 13 15:54:17 MR. INGBER: Objection.
- 14 | 15:54:17 And I'll allow you to answer only to the
- $^{15}$  |  $^{15:54:22}$  extent you're not revealing privileged attorney-client
- 16 15:54:35 communications.
- 17 | 15:54:37 THE WITNESS: I don't recall specifically
- $18 \mid 15:54:38 \text{ what I added.} \quad \text{I just know that I worked on this}$
- 19 15:54:42 project primarily with our lawyers, but as far as
- 20 | 15:54:51 specific things, and again, I wasn't an engineer, I'm
- $^{21}$  |  $^{15:54:57}$  not really a product person, I just had been reviewing
- $22 \mid 15:54:59$  the videos in the early days. So my input was helpful
- $23 \mid 15:55:05$  to try to come up with these tools.
- 24 | 15:55:08 MR. VERRILLI: Q. And you don't have any
- $25 \mid 15:55:11$  reason to doubt that all private videos were, in fact,

- $^{2}$  |  $^{15:55:14}$  screened after this feature was implemented; do you?
- 3 | 15:55:16 MR. INGBER: Objection; lacks foundation.
- 4 | 15:55:18 You can answer.
- 5 | 15:55:19 THE WITNESS: Again, I don't recall
- $6\mid 15:55:24$  specifically, but I don't have any reason to believe
- 7 | 15:55:27 that -- that it wasn't.
- 8 15:55:30 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, to your knowledge,
- $9 \mid 15:55:33$  were the other elements of the changes in practice
- $10 \mid 15:55:40$  identified in this document actually implemented?
- 11 15:55:44 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 12 15:56:13 THE WITNESS: I can't recall specifically. I
- 13 | 15:56:20 know you have to confirm your e-mail address, so I
- 14 | 15:56:23 can -- I know that is a feature that's on the site
- 15 | 15:56:25 now.
- 16 15:56:27 I don't ever recall having an e-mail alert
- 17 | 15:56:30 for flagged at YouTube, so I can't recall, so I can't
- $18 \mid 15:56:38$  really give specifics on all this stuff. Again,
- 19 | 15:56:41 because I wasn't directly --
- 20 | 15:56:41 MR. VERRILLI: Q. And --
- 21 15:56:44 THE WITNESS: -- involved in the day-to-day.
- 22 15:56:45 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Sorry. I didn't mean to
- 23 | 15:56:47 interrupt you.
- 24 15:56:47 Under "Scope," the first item is "Screening
- 25 | 15:56:50 of Only Flagged/Private Video"; do you see that?

- 2 | 15:56:54 A I see that.
- 3 15:56:55 Q Okay. So is one of the changes that this
- $4 \mid 15:57:01$  feature described in this exhibit bringing about is an
- $5 \mid 15:57:10$  end to the review on a proactive basis of all of
- 6 | 15:57:15 the -- of thumbnails of all of the videos that are
- $7 \mid 15:57:19$  being uploaded to YouTube?
- 8 15:57:21 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 9 15:57:24 THE WITNESS: It's -- I don't recall the
- 10 | 15:57:41 specific timetable, but I believe we stopped reviewing
- 11 | 15:57:44 all videos earlier around that Thanksgiving time
- $12 \mid 15:57:49$  period because it was -- it was impossible to do, so
- $13 \mid 15:57:57$  that's why we were creating these tools.
- 14 15:58:01 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, was the decision to
- $15 \mid 15:58:08$  stop reviewing all videos based on the advice that
- 16 | 15:58:14 your lawyers gave you?
- 17 | 15:58:18 MR. INGBER: Objection; that question in
- 18 | 15:58:21 itself may call for the disclosure of privileged
- 19 | 15:58:26 attorney-client communications. So I'm going to
- 20 15:58:29 instruct the witness not to answer.
- 21 15:58:30 MR. VERRILLI: Okay. I'm not trying to be
- 22 | 15:58:32 difficult about this. We have an issue about advice
- 23 | 15:58:34 of counsel.
- 24 15:58:35 MR. INGBER: I understand.
- 25 | 15:58:35 MR. VERRILLI: I'm going to make a record,

- $^{2}$  |  $^{15:58:38}$  okay, and you can instruct the witness not to answer,
- $3 \mid 15:58:40$  and it will be fine.
- $4 \mid 15:58:41$  Q So what I'm trying to get at here,
- $^{5}\mid^{15:58:43}$  Mr. Hurley, is whether you relied on the advice of
- $6 \mid 15:58:47$  counsel in shaping the policies set forth in this
- 7 | 15:58:51 document?
- 8 | 15:58:52 MR. INGBER: Is that a question?
- 9 | 15:58:55 MR. VERRILLI: Yes.
- 10 15:58:55 MR. INGBER: Okay. I instruct you not to
- $11 \mid 15:58:58$  answer to the extent that it will reveal privileged
- 12 | 15:59:01 attorney-client communications.
- 13 | 15:59:09 Actually, strike that. I instruct you not to
- 14 | 15:59:12 answer the question on the ground that it will reveal
- 15 | 15:59:14 attorney-client communications.
- 16 | 15:59:16 MR. VERRILLI: Okay.
- $17 \mid 15:59:20$  Q Tell me the names of the attorneys with whom
- $18 \mid 15:59:23$  you were conferring during the process that led up to
- $19 \mid 15:59:27$  these policy changes?
- 20 | 15:59:30 A Brian Knapp and Kathy Kirkman.
- $21 \mid 15:59:34$  Q And were they lawyers at the Wilson, Sonsini
- 22 | 15:59:37 firm?
- 23 15:59:37 A Yes.
- 24 15:59:37 Q Okay. Anyone else?
- 25 | 15:59:40 A Not that I recall.

- $2 \mid 15:59:42$  Q Did YouTube have an in-house lawyer at this
- 3 | 15:59:44 time?
- 4 | 15:59:47 A I'm not sure.
- 5 | 15:59:54 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're really getting low
- 6 | 15:59:55 on tape now.
- 7 | 15:59:58 MR. VERRILLI: Okay. Let's take our break
- 8 16:00:00 now.
- 9 16:00:00 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the end of
- 10 16:00:01 videotape number two in the deposition of Brent Hurley
- 11 16:00:04 on August 26th, 2008.
- 12 16:00:07 The time is 3:59 p.m. -- :54 p.m.
- 13 16:00:12 We're off the record.
- 14 16:00:13 (Recess taken.)
- 15 16:23:51 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the beginning of
- 16 16:23:53 videotape number three in the deposition of
- 17 | 16:23:57 Brent Hurley on August 26th, 2008. The time is
- 18 16:24:00 4:23 p.m.
- 19 16:24:01 We are back on the record.
- 20 16:24:04 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Mr. Hurley, before the
- 21 | 16:24:06 break, we were talking about Exhibit 17. Could you
- 22 16:24:11 take another look at that?
- 23 16:24:12 A Sure.
- 24 16:24:12 Q This was the YouTube feature description.
- 25 | 16:24:21 A Yes.

- $2\mid 16:57:33$  please. So just to remind you, Exhibit 3 is an e-mail
- $3 \mid 16:57:59$  from you to Jawed Karim dated November 22nd, 2005,
- 4 | 16:58:05 correct?
- 5 16:58:05 A Correct.
- 6 16:58:05 Q You're responding to an e-mail that Mr. Karim
- $7 \mid 16:58:09$  sent to you on November 22nd asking you why YouTube
- $8 \mid 16:58:14$  got rid of the copyright flagging; correct?
- 9 16:58:16 A Yes.
- 10 16:58:16 Q Now, it's true, isn't it, that YouTube for a
- 11 | 16:58:19 time had a copyright flagging feature; correct?
- 12 16:58:22 A Yes.
- 13 16:58:22 Q Okay. Explain to me how that feature worked
- 14 16:58:25 when it was in operation?
- $15 \mid 16:58:31$  A As you see in this e-mail, it shows there are
- 16 | 16:58:35 a number of things you could flag a video for on being
- $17 \mid 16:58:40$  feature this to promote, try to get your video on the
- 18 | 16:58:46 front page inappropriate, miscategorized and
- 19 16:58:51 copyright.
- 20 16:58:54 Q So explain to me, please, how the feature
- 21 | 16:58:58 worked.
- 22 16:58:58 A Although there are these different buckets,
- $23 \mid 16:59:01$  they just were flagged and -- and put into the queue.
- 24 16:59:05 Q So while this feature was operative, if a
- 25 | 16:59:09 YouTube user flagged a video for copyright, then it

- $2 \mid 16:59:13$  would go into the queue; correct?
- 3 16:59:16 A Yeah.
- 4 16:59:17 Q And it would be reviewed to determine whether
- $5 \mid 16:59:19$  it was likely to be an unauthorized upload of
- 6 | 16:59:22 copyrighted work; correct?
- $7 \mid 16:59:31$  A Yeah, I think that was the thinking at the
- 8 | 16:59:37 time.
- 9 | 16:59:38 Q You used the word "yeah" when you started
- 10 16:59:42 that answer. You meant "yes"?
- 11 16:59:45 A Yes.
- 12 16:59:45 Q Okay. And then there came a point where
- 13 | 16:59:50 YouTube made a policy decision to remove the copyright
- 14 16:59:55 flagging feature; correct?
- 15 16:59:58 A Yes.
- 16 16:59:58 Q So when you had the feature, you were
- 17 | 17:00:04 reviewing videos, "you" meaning YouTube -- let me --
- $18 \mid 17:00:09$  let me start over so we don't have any lack of
- 19 | 17:00:11 clarity.
- 20 17:00:11 When the feature was in place, YouTube was
- 21 | 17:00:14 reviewing videos to determine whether they were likely
- 22 | 17:00:18 to be unauthorized uploads of copyrighted works;
- 23 | 17:00:23 correct?
- 24 17:00:25 MR. INGBER: Hold on.
- 25 17:00:40 Objection to the form of the question to the

- $2 \mid 17:00:42$  extent it mischaracterizes the witness's testimony.
- 3 17:00:44 MR. VERRILLI: You can answer the question.
- $4 \mid 17:00:48$  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question,
- 5 | 17:00:49 please?
- 6 17:00:49 MR. VERRILLI: Could you read it back,
- 7 | 17:00:50 please.
- 8 17:01:10 (Whereupon, record read by the Reporter as
- 9 17:01:10 follows:
- 10 16:59:58 "Question: So when you had the feature, you
- 11 | 17:00:04 were reviewing videos, "you" meaning YouTube
- 12 17:00:08 -- let me -- let me start over so we don't
- 13 17:00:10 have any lack of clarity.
- 14 17:00:11 "When the feature was in place, YouTube was
- 15 | 17:00:14 reviewing videos to determine whether they
- 16 17:00:18 were likely to be unauthorized uploads of
- 17 | 17:00:22 copyrighted works; correct?")
- 18 17:01:12 THE WITNESS: So again, this e-mail was dated
- 19 | 17:01:25 November 22nd. I think the subsequent e-mail was like
- 20 | 17:01:30 two days later where we stopped reviewing all the
- $21 \mid 17:01:35$  thumbnails of the videos being uploaded. At this
- 22 | 17:01:39 time, we had received notices from content owners
- $23 \mid 17:01:43$  asking us to remove things from the site. So, you
- $24 \mid 17:01:48 \mid 17:0$
- 25 17:01:51 different features to -- to again address this

- $^{2}$  |  $^{17:01:55}$  problem. One of these was that this copyright flag
- 3 17:02:01 that we had but then quickly realized that it was
- $^{4}\mid ^{17:02:06}$  completely ineffective, there was -- people could flag
- $5 \mid 17:02:13$  things that they, you know, weren't the copyright
- $6 \mid 17:02:15$  owner. They might be upset with one of their friends
- $7 \mid 17:02:21$  and flag a video.
- 8 17:02:23 There was just a whole host of things, and we
- $9 \mid 17:02:25$  were in no position to know who -- if -- if the
- 10 | 17:02:32 content was -- was authorized and also whoever was
- 11 | 17:02:36 flagging the video, if they were authorized to make
- $12 \mid 17:02:39$  the judgment call to have it removed or request to
- 13 | 17:02:42 have it removed.
- 14 17:02:44 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, the user who flagged
- $^{15}$  17:02:47 it didn't make a judgment call to remove it; correct?
- 16 17:02:49 MR. INGBER: Objection; calls for
- 17 | 17:02:51 speculation.
- 18 17:02:54 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Let me rephrase it.
- 19 17:02:55 A Yeah.
- 20 17:02:55 Q YouTube made the decision whether to remove
- $21 \mid 17:02:57$  the flagged videos, not the user; correct?
- 22 | 17:03:01 A Remove this copyright flag?
- 23 | 17:03:03 Q Any flagged video. YouTube made the decision
- 24 | 17:03:06 to remove a flagged video, not the user; correct?
- 25 | 17:03:10 MR. INGBER: Objection; argumentative.

- $2 \mid 17:03:11$  THE WITNESS: After a video is flagged, we
- $^{3}$   $|_{17:03:16}$  review it to, you know, use our best efforts to -- to
- $4 \mid 17:03:19$  see if the video violates the terms of use, and then
- $5 \mid 17:03:23 \text{ yes, we remove it from the site.}$
- 6 | 17:03:25 MR. VERRILLI: Right.
- 7 17:03:25 Q The flagging by the user does not
- $^{8}$  |  $^{17:03:27}$  automatically result in the removal?
- 9 17:03:29 A No.
- 10 17:03:30 Q The removal occurs when YouTube makes a
- 11 | 17:03:33 judgment that the video should be removed; correct?
- 12 17:03:37 A That is correct.
- 13 17:03:37 Q And for --
- 14 17:03:38 A And I'd just like to add that, you know,
- $^{15}$  |  $^{17:03:41}$  things like porn are -- are easy to sort of see that
- 16 | 17:03:44 they violated the terms of use. You look at the
- 17 | 17:03:47 video, you know all the information you need is
- $18 \mid 17:03:49$  contained in that video, so we can remove those in
- $19 \mid 17:03:56$  confidence that they are, in fact, violations of the
- 20 17:03:58 Terms of Use.
- $21 \mid 17:04:01$  Again, other pieces of content which may be
- $22 \mid 17:04:04$  unauthorized, we have no way of knowing if, in fact,
- $23 \mid 17:04:09$  the content owner did authorize and did see the site
- 24 | 17:04:13 with their videos.
- 25 | 17:04:15 One example that's pointed to a lot is the

- 2 17:30:45 THE WITNESS: Yeah. So my understanding of
- 3 | 17:30:47 an MD5 hash, it's a unique thumbprint of the video
- 4 17:30:52 file, but the exact video file needs to be uploaded to
- $5 \mid 17:30:55$  produce a matching fingerprint.
- 6 17:30:58 So if -- if you took one clip and it was a --
- $7 \mid 17:31:04$  a two-minute clip of this video and we got a notice,
- 8 17:31:09 or it was inappropriate and we took it down, if
- 9 17:31:13 another user tried to upload it but they had edited,
- $10 \mid 17:31:16$  so it was only one of the two minutes, then it would
- 11 | 17:31:20 be a different thumbprint, so it wouldn't be able to
- 12 | 17:31:24 recognize that.
- 13 | 17:31:25 MR. VERRILLI: Right.
- 14 17:31:26 Q So it was ineffective unless the -- unless
- $15 \mid 17:31:30$  the subsequent upload was exactly identical to the
- 16 17:31:34 clip that had been taken down; correct?
- 17 | 17:31:36 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 18 17:31:41 THE WITNESS: It was the best solution at the
- $19 \mid 17:31:43$  time. And again it was a -- a feature that we
- 20 | 17:31:46 introduced that, to my knowledge, no other video site
- $21 \mid 17:31:49$  had introduced showing that we were actively trying to
- 22 17:31:55 address this, this issue.
- 23 | 17:31:57 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, if you had gotten an
- 24 | 17:31:59 MD5 hash of an entire episode of a television show,
- $25 \mid 17:32:04$  then any clip that was uploaded that matched any part

- 2 | 17:32:10 of the television show would have been blocked;
- 3 | 17:32:13 wouldn't it?
- 4 17:32:14 THE WITNESS: No.
- 5 17:32:14 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 6 17:32:15 THE WITNESS: That's exactly what I said
- $7\mid 17:32:17$  wouldn't happen. That's what I was outlining the
- $8\mid 17:32:20$  fundamental limitations of this MD5 hash, that it
- $9 \mid 17:32:24$  needed to be the exact same video.
- 10 17:32:28 MR. VERRILLI: Q. So it didn't really block
- 11 | 17:32:30 very many uploads; did it?
- 12 17:32:35 MR. INGBER: Objection; vague.
- 13 17:32:36 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I -- I don't have that
- 14 17:32:38 information, but again, it was a best tool that we had
- $15 \mid 17:32:46$  at the time. We were trying to rapidly come up
- 16 17:32:48 with -- with tools to address this.
- 17 17:32:50 MR. VERRILLI: Q. You think that was the
- 18 | 17:32:51 best available technology at the time, to prevent the
- 19 17:32:54 unauthorized upload of copyrighted works?
- 20 17:32:58 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 21 17:33:02 THE WITNESS: To my knowledge.
- 22 | 17:33:02 MR. VERRILLI: Q. You never heard of Audible
- 23 | 17:33:06 Magic at that time?
- 24 | 17:33:09 A I can't recall.
- 25 | 17:33:11 Q Did you ever here of Audible Magic?

- $^{2\mid 17:35:54}$  witness, we have to repeat our questions.
- 3 17:35:56 MR. INGBER: Okay.
- 4 17:35:57 MR. VERRILLI: I'm sorry for that, but that's
- $5 \mid 17:35:58$  just the way it is.
- 6 17:35:59 MR. INGBER: Just because you're not getting
- $^{7}\mid ^{17:36:00}$  the answers you necessarily want, Don, doesn't make a
- 8 17:36:04 witness evasive.
- 9 17:36:05 MR. VERRILLI: Q. So let's continue to
- $10 \mid 17:36:07$  discuss the Content Verification Program; okay?
- 11 | 17:36:14 A (Witness nods head.)
- 12 | 17:36:14 Q That program was designed to have two phases;
- 13 | 17:36:21 right?
- 14 | 17:36:27 A I don't -- I don't recall specifically. I
- 15 | 17:36:30 know we were adding new features just like we're
- 16 17:36:34 adding new features to the site. Just like rapidly
- 17 | 17:36:38 throughout the entire life of the company.
- 18 | 17:36:40 Q You designed the program; right?
- 19 17:36:43 A I -- yeah, I -- I had the lead working with
- 20 17:36:47 our lawyers and also other product people at the -- at
- 21 | 17:36:51 YouTube.
- 22 17:36:52 MR. VERRILLI: Okay. Can we mark this,
- $23 \mid 17:36:53$  please, as an exhibit?
- 24 | 17:36:53 (Document marked Hurley Exhibit 20
- 25 17:37:10 for identification.)

- 2 17:37:10 MR. INGBER: Thank you.
- 3 | 17:37:11 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Let me know when you're
- $4 \mid 17:37:14$  ready, Mr. Hurley.
- 5 17:38:07 A Okay.
- 6 17:38:07 Q You ready?
- 7 17:38:08 A Yeah.
- 8 17:38:10 Q The first page of this document is an e-mail
- 9 17:38:13 from you to Maryrose Dunton; correct?
- 10 17:38:18 A Correct.
- 11 | 17:38:18 Q And it's dated March 1st, 2006; correct?
- 12 17:38:22 A That's correct.
- 13 17:38:22 Q And it was forwarding an attachment; correct?
- 14 17:38:27 A That's correct.
- 15 | 17:38:28 Q And the attachment describes something called
- 16 17:38:31 a "Content Mgmt System Program Spec"; right?
- 17 | 17:38:34 A That's correct.
- 18 17:38:35 Q And is this document describing the Content
- 19 | 17:38:41 Verification Program?
- 20 17:38:45 A This was a spec sheet, so this was an outline
- $^{21}$  |  $^{17:38:50}$  of what we envisioned it might become, but it wasn't
- $22 \mid 17:38:54$  that the program actually, I believe, launched.
- 23 | 17:38:58 So it wasn't a -- it wasn't a rundown of what
- $24 \mid 17:39:01$  we had created. It was a -- this is what we, you
- 25 17:39:05 know, would like to create.

- $2 \mid 17:39:07$  Q Do you remember how long after you sent this
- $3 \mid 17:39:11$  document to Ms. Dunton you actually launched the
- 4 | 17:39:14 program?
- 5 17:39:16 A I don't recall specifically. I believe that
- $6 \mid 17:39:21$  it would be rolled out there. There are a number of
- $7 \mid 17:39:23$  features listed here, so I don't think it's one day we
- 8 | 17:39:27 turned everything on. It was probably over a series
- 9 17:39:29 of pushes.
- 10 | 17:39:32 Q Well, when did you start pushing the features
- 11 | 17:39:37 out?
- 12 17:39:38 A This -- this is at a time where I was
- $13 \mid 17:39:42$  transitioning again over to the finance and operation
- $14 \mid 17:39:47$  roles. This was sort of my last project with the
- $15 \mid 17:39:51$  reviewing of videos. So I worked on the spec sheet in
- 16 | 17:39:56 conjunction with -- with counsel, but then I sort of
- $17 \mid 17:40:02$  dropped off, and -- and then the actual product people
- $18 \mid 17:40:06$  and engineers then executed and actually created this,
- $19 \mid 17:40:11$  but by that -- by that time I rolled off onto other
- 20 | 17:40:15 duties.
- $21 \mid 17:40:16$  Q So you're not aware that you launched the
- 22 | 17:40:20 Content Verification Program approximately ten days
- 23 17:40:24 after this e-mail was sent?
- 24 17:40:25 A I don't recall.
- 25 | 17:40:29 Q This was a program that you were in charge

```
2 | 17:40:30 of?
```

- 3 | 17:40:31 A Again, it wasn't -- there's a distinction. I
- $^{4}$  | 17:40:34 helped brainstorm about these tools and -- and things
- $5 \mid 17:40:38$  that we could do. Again, there -- there weren't any
- $6 \mid 17:40:41$  other video sites that were employing these things, so
- $7 \mid 17:40:44 \mid \text{I was} -- \mid \text{I was} \mid -- \mid \text{I was looking at other sites like}$
- 8 17:40:48 eBay. You can see the URLs that reference eBay's sort
- $9 \mid 17:40:53$  of similar program that I was looking at.
- 10 17:40:56 But again, I wasn't the -- the "product
- 11 | 17:40:59 manager" for this. I had been transitioning over, so
- $12 \mid 17:41:04$  this is -- these are the -- the brainstorming of these
- $13 \mid 17:41:08$  tools that I interjected and passed over to folks like
- 14 | 17:41:13 Maryrose and then the other engineers to actually
- 15 17:41:14 implement.
- 16 17:41:15 Q Who -- who was the project manager?
- 17 | 17:41:17 A I believe it was Maryrose.
- 18 17:41:19 Q And do you know which engineers worked with
- 19 | 17:41:22 her?
- 20 | 17:41:22 A I don't recall, no.
- 21 17:41:25 Q Okay. So in Phase I of this plan that you
- 22 | 17:41:30 came up with, you notice the last bullet says "Ability
- $23 \mid 17:41:35$  to save searches and have newly added video results
- 24 | 17:41:42 emailed to you on a user-defined frequency"; do you
- 25 | 17:41:44 see that?

```
2 17:41:45 A Yes.
```

- $^{3}$  |  $^{17:41:45}$  Q Can you describe to me what that feature was
- $4 \mid 17:41:47$  intended to be?
- $5 \mid 17:41:48$  MR. INGBER: Hold on a second. I just want
- 6 17:41:50 to caution the witness that to the extent your
- $^{7}$  |  $^{17:41:53}$  testimony will reveal privileged attorney-client
- 8 | 17:41:56 communications, don't answer, but otherwise you can go
- 9 17:41:58 ahead and answer.
- 10 17:41:59 THE WITNESS: Again, this was a feature
- $11 \mid 17:42:05$  directed primarily at the content owners making it
- 12 | 17:42:08 easier for them to monitor their content so it
- $13 \mid 17:42:13$  would -- they could define at their direction what --
- $14 \mid 17:42:18$  what keywords that they would like to save as sort of
- $15 \mid 17:42:22$  a predefined search, and then could e-mail to them so
- 16 | 17:42:27 they could just look at -- look at -- they could --
- $17 \mid 17:42:31$  the vision was that they could define the searches,
- 18 | 17:42:35 the frequency that they receive these e-mails so they
- $19 \mid 17:42:38$  could get them daily, weekly, monthly, but it would
- 20 | 17:42:42 be, again, at their direction.
- 21 17:42:44 Q So I just want to get clarity on how this
- 22 | 17:42:47 worked. I'm going to give you a hypothetical, and you
- 23 | 17:42:49 tell me if this is accurate.
- 24 17:42:51 A Okay.
- 25 | 17:42:52 Q Okay.

- $2 \mid 17:42:52$  So I'm a content owner, and I am using this
- $^{3}$  |  $^{17:42:59}$  CVP tool to take down clips of The Daily Show.
- 4 17:43:06 A Okay.
- $5 \mid 17:43:06$  Q And to -- as part of my effort in the search
- 6 17:43:11 that I have to undergo to find these clips on YouTube
- $^{7}$  |  $^{17:43:14}$  and get them taken down, I use a keyword search, and I
- $8 \mid 17:43:20$  search for the key words "Daily Show."
- 9 17:43:24 So does this feature then provide that
- $10 \mid 17:43:29$  whenever a video is subsequently uploaded with the tag
- 11 | 17:43:35 that includes the words "Daily Show," I can get an
- 12 | 17:43:40 e-mail telling me that that's happened?
- 13 17:43:42 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 14 17:43:43 You can answer it.
- $15 \mid 17:43:45$  THE WITNESS: I believe that was the -- the
- 16 | 17:43:48 vision, but I don't believe this was ever a feature
- 17 | 17:43:54 that ever came to life.
- 18 | 17:43:55 MR. VERRILLI: Right.
- 19 17:43:56 Q Never happened; correct?
- 20 17:43:57 A Yeah.
- 21 17:43:57 Q Okay. Do you know why?
- 22 17:44:00 MR. INGBER: Again, don't answer if you're
- $23 \mid 17:44:04$  going to reveal any communications with counsel.
- 24 17:44:06 THE WITNESS: Again, after submitting these
- $25 \mid 17:44:13$  suggestions for -- for tools that we could create, I

- $^{2}\mid^{17:44:17}$  dropped off of it, so I didn't actually implement the
- 3 | 17:44:20 program. So I couldn't say why some features were
- 4 17:44:26 adopted and others were not, because I wasn't actually
- $5 \mid 17:44:30$  implementing the program myself.
- 6 17:44:33 MR. VERRILLI: Q. In your communication with
- $7 \mid 17:44:34$  Maryrose Dunton about this program that we're
- 8 17:44:37 discussing, did she ever tell you that she hated the
- 9 | 17:44:40 e-mail feature that we've been discussing?
- 10 17:44:44 A I don't recall.
- 11 17:44:46 Q Were you aware that, in fact, she hated this
- 12 | 17:44:49 feature?
- 13 | 17:44:50 A I don't recall.
- 14 17:44:52 Q So it's possible she did tell you?
- 15 17:44:54 MR. INGBER: Objection; asked and answered.
- 16 17:44:57 THE WITNESS: No, I don't recall receiving.
- 17 | 17:45:03 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Were you aware that she
- $18 \mid 17:45:06$  referred to the content owners who would benefit to
- 19 17:45:10 this e-mail fingers as "A-holes."
- 20 17:45:15 MR. INGBER: Objection.
- 21 17:45:15 THE WITNESS: No, I'm not aware of that. I
- 22 | 17:45:20 don't recall that.
- 23 17:45:20 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Were you aware that she
- $24 \mid 17:45:23$  did not want to do anything to help the content owners
- 25 | 17:45:25 she referred to as "A-holes"?

- 2 17:45:25 MR. INGBER: Objection to form. I don't know
- $^{3}$  |  $^{17:45:27}$  what you're talking about, but to the extent it
- $^{4}$  |  $^{17:45:30}$  mischaracterizes a document or testimony --
- 5 17:45:35 MR. VERRILLI: You really don't want me to
- 6 17:45:36 pull out this document; do you? I mean, you know, you
- $7\mid 17:45:40$  had World War III last week about it.
- 8 17:45:44 MR. INGBER: I'm not going to tell you how to
- 9 17:45:46 conduct your deposition, but you're asking questions
- $10 \mid 17:45:50$  and apparently referring to testimony or a document,
- $11 \mid 17:45:53$  and so I'm just preserving my objection for the
- 12 17:45:55 record.
- 13 17:45:55 MR. VERRILLI: Fine.
- 14 | 17:45:56 Q And all I want to know is whether you were
- $15 \mid 17:45:57$  aware of these things.
- 16 17:45:58 A I don't recall.
- 17 | 17:45:59 Q Were you aware she actively discouraged
- 18 | 17:46:02 rolling out this e-mail feature behind your back?
- 19 17:46:05 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 20 17:46:06 THE WITNESS: No, I don't recall.
- 21 17:46:07 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Were you aware that
- 22 | 17:46:12 Matt Rizzo also actively opposed rolling out this
- 23 | 17:46:16 e-mail feature?
- 24 17:46:17 MR. INGBER: Objection.
- 25 | 17:46:17 THE WITNESS: No, I don't recall. Again, I

- $^{2}$  |  $^{17:46:19}$  wasn't -- I wasn't implementing these suggestions.
- 3 17:46:24 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Were you aware that
- 4 | 17:46:25 Maryrose Dunton and Matt Rizzo agreed together to try
- 5 | 17:46:31 to delay the rollout of this e-mail feature?
- 6 17:46:34 MR. INGBER: Objection.
- 7 17:46:35 THE WITNESS: Again, I -- I don't know,
- $^{8}$  | 17:46:38 because I wasn't implementing these suggestions. I
- 9 | 17:46:42 don't know why some were implemented and others were
- 10 | 17:46:45 not.
- 11 17:46:45 MR. VERRILLI: Q. How many employees were
- 12 | 17:46:46 there at YouTube during this March 2006 time frame?
- 13 | 17:47:01 A I don't recall specifically, but if I had --
- 14 17:47:03 I would -- I would say probably around 30.
- 15 17:47:06 Q Okay. And Matt Rizzo was one of them?
- 16 17:47:10 A I can't recall specifically when he was
- 17 | 17:47:12 hired.
- 18 17:47:13 Q You know who he is?
- 19 17:47:14 A Yes.
- 20 | 17:47:15 Q And he's -- he was an employee of YouTube?
- 21 17:47:17 A Yes.
- 22 17:47:17 Q He still is an employee of YouTube?
- 23 17:47:20 A Yes.
- 24 17:47:20 Q He's an engineer?
- 25 17:47:22 A Yes.

- $2 \mid 17:47:22$  Q Okay. Were you aware that he referred to the
- 3 | 17:47:26 content owners who would benefit from this e-mail
- $4 \mid 17:47:30$  system as "assholes"?
- 5 17:47:33 MR. INGBER: Objection to form.
- 6 17:47:33 THE WITNESS: No, I'm not aware.
- 7 17:47:35 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Were you aware that
- 8 | 17:47:36 Maryrose Dunton and Matt Rizzo agreed to go to Chad
- 9 17:47:41 Hurley and tell him that YouTube should not implement
- 10 | 17:47:46 this e-mail feature?
- 11 | 17:47:48 MR. INGBER: Same objection to the extent
- 12 17:47:51 you're mischaracterizing documents in this case.
- 13 17:47:55 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Again, I can't recall.
- 14 | 17:47:58 I wasn't -- I wasn't part of those conversations, so I
- 15 | 17:48:02 don't --
- 16 17:48:02 MR. VERRILLI: Q. Well, did your brother
- 17 | 17:48:03 Chad ever come to you and ask you about this e-mail
- 18 | 17:48:07 notification system?
- 19 | 17:48:10 A I don't recall.
- $20 \mid 17:48:10$  Q Okay. Now, in this -- back to the document.
- $21 \mid 17:48:17$  There's Phase II here described.
- 22 | 17:48:20 A Uh-huh.
- 23 | 17:48:21 Q The first bullet point says "Voluntary
- $24 \mid 17:48:26$  monitoring and removal by YouTube by potentially
- 25 | 17:48:30 infringing videos"; do you see that?